



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,995	04/14/2004	Hugues Dionne	GO30-002	7237
21567	7590	11/12/2004	EXAMINER	
WELLS ST. JOHN P.S. 601 W. FIRST AVENUE, SUITE 1300 SPOKANE, WA 99201			NGUYEN, JIMMY T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3725	
DATE MAILED: 11/12/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/824,995

Applicant(s)

DIONNE, HUGUES

Examiner

Jimmy T Nguyen

Art Unit

3725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04142004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "plurality of spaced-apart pulsators" (claim 6, line 7 and claim 15, line 13); " baffles have fin-shaped blade portion" (claim 10, line 2 and claim 19, line 2); "a pair of diametrically opposed baffles" (claim 11); " a bearing housing" (claim 13, line 2 and claim 22, line 2); and "a disc" (claim 14, line 2 and claim 23, line 2) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified

Art Unit: 3725

and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claim 15, line 14 is objected to because of the following informalities:

The word "in" should be deleted.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 6-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which were not described in the original specification. For example:

Regarding claim 6, lines 7-10, the original specification does not support the limitation "a plurality of spaced-apart pulsators is provided within said chamber adjacent said outboard end wall for creating hydraulic pulses against said outboard end wall by repeatedly directing waves of incoming material thereagainst".

Regarding claims 6-8, 12-13, 15-17, 21-22, the original specification does not support the limitation "an outboard end wall".

Art Unit: 3725

Regarding claims 8, 9, 10, 18, 19, 20, the original specification does not support the limitation "baffles".

Regarding claims 10 and 19, the original specification does not support the limitation "the baffles have a fin-shaped blade portion".

Regarding claim 11, the original specification does not support the limitation "the baffles include a pair of diametrically opposed baffles".

Regarding claims 12 and 22, the original specification does not support the limitation "a bearing housing".

Regarding claims 14 and 23, the original specification does not support the limitation "a perforated plate is provided in the form of a disc"

Regarding claim 15; lines 13-14, the original specification does not support the limitation "a set of pulsators is provided adjacent said outboard end wall for directing waves of incoming material against said outboard end wall".

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-5 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,736,054, as taken alone, or further in view of Craig et al. (hereinafter "Craig") (US 3,688,687).

Although the conflicting claims (claim 1) are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the rearranging of the scraper blade assembly from being contacted with the screen to be in near-contact with the screen involves only routine skill in the art. Both of the locations (contact and near-contact) of the scraping assembly with respect to the screen would prevent the screen from becoming clogged, and they do not provide any unexpected result. Therefore, it would have been obvious matter of design choice to relocate the scraping assembly from being contacted with the screen to be in near-contact with the screen, since such rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the mechanical art. Additionally, the disclosure does not state any advantage for this limitation.

The patent to Craig can be applied to show a screw press (10) having a scraping assembly (41) that is mounted in a near-contact with a screen (42) (fig. 3), Craig teaches this construction of the scraping assembly in order to keep the screen from becoming clogged (col. 5, lines 32-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide US 6,736,054's scraping assembly to be in near-contact with the screen, as taught by Craig, so as to prevent the screen from being clogged.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jimmy T Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-5304.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 8:00am - 6:30pm.

Art Unit: 3725

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allen Ostrager can be reached on (703) 308-3136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JTNguyen
November 09, 2004



ALLEN OSTRAGER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700